

REMARKS

Claims 31-50 are pending. Claims 1-30 are currently canceled. Claims 43-50 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 31 and 43 are currently amended.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Support for the amendments to claims 31 and 43 adding “autoclaving” can be found in the specification, for example, on page 2, lines 7-11. Support for the amendments to claims 31 and 43 adding “said optical film including a stack of at least 100 optical layers” can be found in the specification, for example, on page 2, lines 1-2. Claim 43 has also been amended to correct an editorial error.

Election/Restriction

Applicant is said to be required to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. Claims 31-42 are listed in the Office Action as being in Group I, and are said to be drawn to an optical sheet. Claims 43-50 are listed in the Office Action as being in Group II, and are said to be drawn to a method of making a glazing laminate

Applicant hereby elects claims 21-42 (i.e., Group I claims) with traverse.

Part of the reasoning given in the Office Action for the restriction of the two groups of claims is that “It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used to [sic] laser cutting and welding method of [‘203 (Soodak et al.)] along the peripheral of the optical sheet of [‘337 (Schrenk et al.)] in order to reduce the films tendency towards delamination.”

It is submitted that one skilled in the art would not combine ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) and ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as suggested in the Office Action. It is alleged later in the Office Action under the obvious rejection of claims 31 and 32 that the inventions in ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) are both drawn to the field of “multilayer polymeric articles.” However, the type of “multilayer polymeric articles” each is drawn to is significantly different, and the teachings of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) relied on to modify ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) are not appropriate for the optical sheet claimed in claim 31. ‘203 (Soodak et al.) makes no reference or suggestion that their teachings would be useful with a multi-layer optical film as required in Applicants’ claims, including that after use of their teachings, as suggested in the Office Action, the resulting film would still be useful for it’s intended purpose given the processing effects the ‘203 (Soodak et al.) would have on a multi-layer optical film as required in Applicants’ claims. Therefore, it is submitted that at least part of the reasoning to support the restriction is not supported by the evidence set forth.

Reconsideration and appropriate modification of the restriction is requested.

§103 Rejections

- U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.)

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.).

The rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) should be withdrawn.

As amended, claim 31 is directed toward an optical sheet suitable for use in a laminate comprising at least one glazing component having a peripheral edge, said optical sheet comprising a non-metallic multi-layer optical film having optical properties that are not provided by layers of elemental metal or metal compounds, said optical film including a stack of at least 100 optical layers, said optical film having multiple layers and a peripheral edge, and said multiple layers are fused together along a substantial portion of only the peripheral edge of said optical film so as to at least substantially reduce delamination of said multiple layers along at least said substantial portion of the peripheral edge of said optical film, where the delamination is caused, at least in part, by stresses placed on said optical film during autoclave glazing lamination processing, wherein the remaining portion of said multiple layers, other than said substantial portion of the peripheral edge, is not fused so as to at least substantially reduce delamination of said multiple layers.

It is submitted that one skilled in the art would not combine ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) and ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as suggested in the Office Action. It is alleged in the Office Action that the inventions in ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) are both drawn to the field of “multilayer polymeric articles.” However, the type of “multilayer polymeric articles” each is drawn to is significantly different, and the teachings of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) relied on to modify ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) are not appropriate for the optical sheet claimed in claim 31. ‘203 (Soodak et al.) makes no reference or suggestion that their teachings would be useful with a multi-layer optical film as required in Applicants’ claims, including that after use of their teachings, as suggested in the Office Action, the resulting film would still be useful for its intended purpose given the processing effects the ‘203 (Soodak et al.) would have on a multi-layer optical film as required in Applicants’ claims.

Claim 32 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. Thus, claim 32 should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) should be withdrawn.

- U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,368,945 (Fujimori et al.)

Claims 33-35, and 37-42 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.).

The rejection of claims 33-35 and 37-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) should be withdrawn.

Claims 33-35 and 37-42 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 31. Claim 31 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) fails to overcome the deficiencies of ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above. Thus, claims 33-35, and 37-42 should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claims 3-35 and 37-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) should be withdrawn.

-U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,203 (Soodak et al.) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,368,945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,334,382 (Gourio).

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of ‘382 (Gourio).

The rejection of claim 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of ‘945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of ‘382 (Gourio) should be withdrawn.

Claim 36 depends from claim 33. Claim 33 is patentable, for example, for reasons given above. ‘382 (Gourio) fails to overcome the deficiencies of ‘337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of ‘203

(Soodak et al.), and further in view of '945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above. Thus, claim 36 should also be patentable.

In summary, the rejection of claim 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over '337 (Schrenk et al.) in view of '203 (Soodak et al.), and further in view of '945 (Fujimori et al.) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of '382 (Gourio) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

February 17, 2009

Date

By: /Gregory D. Allen/

Gregory D. Allen, Reg. No.: 35,048

Telephone No.: 651-736-0641

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833